



# HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

2 Fairgrounds Road  
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554  
[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

**Commissioners:** Raymond Pohl (Chair), Stephen Welch (Vice-chair), Diane Coombs, Abigail Camp, Vallorie Oliver  
**Associate Commissioners:** Jessie Dutra, Carrie Thornewill, Connie Patten

~~ MINUTES ~~

**Tuesday, January 3, 2023**

*Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road & Remote Participation via ZOOM.*

Called to order at 4:07 pm. and announcements by Mr. Pohl

Staff in attendance: Holly Backus, Historic Planner; Esmeralda Martinez, Land Use Specialist; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker

Attending Members: Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra, Thornewill

Remote participant: Coombs

Absent Members: Patten

Late Arrivals: None

Early Departures: Welch, 8:07 pm

Adoption of Agenda:

Motion **Motion to Approve as drafted. (Camp)**

Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye

## I. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. None

## II. COMMISSION COMMENTS

1.

## III. DISCUSSION & VOTE

1. Ms. Coombs' letter to Select Board about reinstatement of advisory boards.

Voting Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates Dutra, Thornewill

Discussion **Coombs** – Presented the letter signed by all to Select Board to reestablish the advisory boards. The Select Board hasn't provided an answer. Along with this is for next week she'd like to have on the agenda is discussions for staffing and commission interaction and her citizen's warrant.

**Mickey Rowland** – Read a statement regarding the letter and urges the HDC push for reinstatement of the advisory boards.

**Angus MacLeod** – He's speaking as chair of Nantucket Historical Commission and 'Sconset advisory. We need an update on how they can best assist to get these boards legally up and running.

**Pohl** – We sent the request; SB deliberated but didn't act upon it. They want to reconvene and discuss it further.

**Camp** – Suggested a follow-up letter asking about the status of the Select Board's decision.

Motion **No action necessary**

Roll-call vote N/A

## IV. CONSENTS

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. 137 Hummock Pd, LLC 12-7531	137 Hummock Pnd Road	New Shed	65/72	Brook Meerbergen
2. Dean Lampe 01-7630	142 Surfside Road	Retaining wall	80/98.1	Dean Lampe
3. Dean Lampe 01-7632	142 Surfside Road	Revise MH dormers	80/98.1	Dean Lampe
4. Dean Lampe 01-7635	142 Surfside Road	Revise garage dormers	80/98.1	Dean Lampe
5. J.J. Jonas 12-7617	9 Columbus Avenue	Change windows	59.3/112	NAG
6. Michael Noonan 11-7452	53 Union Street	Roof replacement	55.1.4/88	Alvaro Castro
7. Susan Mitchell 12-7614	10 Skyline Drive	Rev. MH color	79/7.1	Susan Mitchell
8. Susan Mitchell 12-7613	10 Skyline Drive	Rev. GH color	79/7.1	Susan Mitchell
9. Robert Rios 12-7618	23 Tashama Lane	Replace windows & doors	55/464	Thornewill Design
10. One Bloom, LLC 12-7619	1 Bloom Street	New shed	42.3.3/140	Emeritus
11. Flotron & Newman 12-7550	13 Arkansas Avenue	Add door to garage	59.4/158	NAG
12. John Reddett 12-7620	8 Galen Avenue	Roof replaced – red cedar	29/113	Carey Company
13. Pennel Ames 12-7594	5 Nobska Way	Renew COA 11906	66/26	NAG
14. 4 Amigos, LLC 12-7578	8 F Street	Rev. 07-4257: shed	60.2.1/7.1	Structures Ultd
15. Willauer & Harmon 01-7628	Maple Lane Lot 2	New shed	67/303	LINK

16. Sankaty, LLC 12-7585	79 Polpis Road	Hardscape	44/23.3	Dustin Maury
17. Old Gray Barn 01-7639	12 West York Lane	New dormer & roof replace	55/9.12121	Kevin Sampson
18. Richard Holt 01-7644	121 Madaket Road	Rev. 09-7158	40/60.1	Botticelli & Pohl
19. Old North Wharf 01-7646	28 Old North Wharf	Roof replacement – arch	42.3.1/259	Carey Company
20. Lloyd Realty, LLC 01-7647	7 Heather Lane	GH move on site revision	30/24.2	Sophie Metz
21. Peter Dupont 01-7653	22 Burnt Swamp	Driveway/retaining wall	56/231	KMLD
22. Gelnbeigh, LLC 01-7654	3 Nonantum Avenue	Move shed onsite	87/49	Thornewill Design
23. C. McDermott 01-7655	36.5 South Shore Road	New shed	80/118	SCI
24. Cabko Inc. 01-7658	18B Bartlett Road	Mover door & chng door	67/113.1	NAG
25. Nantucket Land Bank 01-7657	19 Waywinet Road	Hardscape & patio	20/35	Julie Jordin
26. Jen McCormick 01-7656	22 North Mill Street	Rev. 06-4021: color change	55.4.4/80.1	Brook Meerbergen
27. William Grieder 01-7652	10 F Street	Rooftop solar	60.2.1/7.2	Cotuit Solar
28. Bruce Hermansdorfer 01-7651	11 Deer Run Road	Rooftop solar	57/20	Cotuit Solar
29. John Jordin 01-7650	28 Lovers Lane	Solar roof array	68/145	ACK Smart
30. Tuttle Sanford 01-7649	134 Old South Road	Antenna	69/38	Adam Wolfrey
31. Ocean Heath, LLC 01-7648	9 Falmouth Avenue	Hardscape	82/423	JN Design
32. Howard Martin 01-7645	2 Back Street	New gutters	55/359	Howard Martin
33. 11 Osprey, LLC 01-7643	11 Osprey Way	Door change	82/3	EMDA
34. Richard Farrell Trust 01-7642	12 Gay Street	New porch	42.3.4/13	Normand Residential
35. Margaret Manganaro 11-7492	7 Summer Street	Roof replacement	42.3.3/114	Ned Paul
36. Michael Stone Et al 01-7640	6 Marcus Way	Pavilion	91/9.1	Jardins Int.
37. Jennifer Broadbent 01-7641	2B White Whale Lane	New shed	66/538	Jennifer Broadbent

Voting Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra  
 Alternates None  
 Recused Pohl from Item 18, Thornewill from Items 9 & 22  
 Documentation None  
 Representing Karen Alence, Cotuit Solar  
 Public William Grieder, 10 F Street  
 Concerns **Camp** – Regarding Item 27 solar on 10 F Street. They are on 4 different planes, but the one facing west will be visible from Hither Creek. This is an old community with small old houses and thinks it will be out of place.  
**Pohl** – The only array that would be visible is the one on the western side; there’s a cottage between it and the water.  
**Oliver** – It is on the front of the building.  
**Welch** – You can’t see the array on the front elevation from the street.  
**Grieder** – Took a picture from the water indicating visibility from the water. Also took a photo of a neighbor’s array visible from the Creek as well as E Street. Asked this be held for Ms. Alence to represent. We had to remove all our shrubs to install a new septic.  
**Welch** – Suggested getting a sense of the commissioners of removing the west elevation 2 northern pieces to maintain a rectilinear form and simplify the view from the water. If you put the panels on the garage, it moves them closer to the water and in his opinion increases the visibility from the water.  
**Oliver** – Suggested moving the west elevation array to the garage.  
**Coombs** – Agrees with Mr. Welch’s ideas of making it “neat” on the west elevation roof.  
**Camp** – She’d like to view this.  
**Pohl** – He’s fine with Mr. Welch’s proposal.  
**Alliance** – We could remove those 2 and put them on the south elevation west-facing roof.  
 Motion **Motion to Approve but Item 27. (Camp)**  
 Roll-call vote Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver Coombs, Dutra, and Welch-aye Certificate # **HDC(as noted)**  
 Motion **Motion to Approve Item 27 through staff with the removal of the 2 northern most panels on the northwest elevation and added to the southeasterly west facing roof. (Welch)**  
 Roll-call vote Carried 3-2//Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye; Oliver & Camp-nay Certificate # **HDC2023-01-7652**

**V. CONSENTS WITH CONDITIONS**

Property owner name	Street Address	Scope of work	Map/Parcel	Agent
1. Gelnbeigh, LLC 01-7638	33 Nonantum	Pool & patio	87/49	Thornewill Design
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application				
2. 23 Morey NT 01-7637	23 Morey Lane	Pool & hardscape	73.3.2/2	Jardins Intl.
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application				
3. Richard Dlezk 01-7636	56 Madaquecham	New pool	8/65	KMLD
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application				
4. Liza Ottani 01-7634	4 Jonathan Way	Pool & hardscape	75/47	SCI
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application				
5. Michael Stone Et al 01-7629	6 Marcus Way	Spa & fencing	91/9.1	Jardins Intl.
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application				
6. Brian Rice 12-7616	2 Reacher Ln	Pool & Fence revision	66/337.2	Waterscapes
• Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application				

- 7. Blaise Sheppard **01-7631**                      2 Brinda Ln                      Pool Revision                      67/274                      Waterscapes
  - Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application
- 8. Jennifer Panner **11-7460**                      6 Hickory Meadow Ln                      Pool & hardscape                      41/205                      Scott Fritz
  - Pool not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & pool to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application
- 9. Jennifer Panner **01-7633**                      6 Hickory Meadow Ln                      New spa                      41/205                      Scott Fritz
  - Spa not to be visible at time of inspection and in perpetuity & Spa to have no grade change from existing or as noted on the original application

Voting                      Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver

Alternates                      Dutra, Thornewill

Recused                      Dutra

Documentation                      None

Representing                      None

Public                      None

Concerns                      No additional concerns.

Motion                      **Motion to Approve through staff per noted conditions. (Coombs)**

Roll-call vote                      Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Welch, Coombs, and Pohl-aye

Certificate #                      **HDC (as noted)**

**VI. OLD BUSINESS 11/01/2022**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. K225, LLC <b>09-7073</b>	126R Main Street	Garage demo	42.3.2/98	Linda Williams

Voting                      Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra

Alternates                      Thornewill

Recused                      None

Documentation                      Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, advisory comments.

Representing                      Linda Williams

Public                      Chip Stahl, owner

Andrea Bradford, 128 Main Street

Alger, for 124 Main Street

Hillary Rayport, 89 Main Street

Concerns (4:43) **Williams** – Reviewed the project. Referenced former owner’s letter of support; circa late 1920s early 1930s.

**Stahl** – The garage is in terrible, rotted condition; there’s nothing left to be saved. There’s 1.5X3.5 timbers and Weyerhaeuser plywood. He’s curious about the alternatives; to rebuild it, it would have to be demolished.

**Backus** – HDC survey circa 1915. It would be sad to lose this contributing out building. Would prefer it be moved and restored. Appreciate the additional documents. Abutters have sent in comments and concerns included into the record.

**Bradford** – This is characteristic of upper Main Street construction and is visible from Main Street. The owner wants a new curb cut and parking and should be discussed. According to the Sanborne Maps it was built in 1915. These small garages are traditional to the neighborhood and should be preserved. Asked HDC deny the demolition.

**Alger** – Her client agrees with Ms. Backus and that it should be renovated/rebuilt in place.

**Rayport** – Agrees with Ms. Backus, Ms. Alger, and Ms. Backus. We rely on HDC to preserve historic structures. That is in the setback is a condition created by the 41-81L subdivision. The original planning Board packet had a photo of the interior, which shows a sound structure; it was pulled out with this submission.

**Coombs** – From the photos we’ve seen, this can be saved. There seems to be a need to remove this so another house can go behind it. This building must be saved and maintained.

**Camp** – Agrees with Ms. Coombs. We’re here to preserve the history of Nantucket. In respect to scale and streetscape, this should be renovated.

**Dutra** – He agrees with Ms. Camp point. He would agree with the demolition with this building being replaced with something reflective of this.

**Oliver** – Agrees with Ms. Coombs.

**Pohl** – You could renovate that building but that would essentially be a rebuild; at that point it becomes a new building. Saving the intention of the old garage would be a reconstruction of this. Whether it stays in that location is questionable; it would be a new building.

Motion                      **Motion to Deny the demolition. (Oliver)**

Roll-call vote                      Carried 3-2//Camp, Coombs, and Oliver-aye; Pohl and Dutra-nay

Certificate #                      **HDC2022-09-7073**

2.	K225, LLC 03-5944	126 Main Street	Main house renovation	42.3.2/98	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver				
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill				
Recused	None				
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, advisory comments and <i>Building with Nantucket in Mind (BWNIM)</i> .				
Representing	Linda Williams Juraj Bencat Chip Stahl, owner				
Public	Alger, for 124 Main Street Sam Bradford, 128 Main Street Hillary Rayport, 89 Main Street Mickey Rowland,				

Concerns (5:06)

**Williams** – Need to get it tight to the weather. Reviewed changes made per previous concerns. It is not moving. Referred to the letter from Toscana regarding the need for a new full foundation under the entire house.

**Bencat** – Windows on the existing main mass front elevation will be true-divided light (TDL) and the rest will be simulated-delighted light (SDL).

**Stahl** – He’s all about historic preservation; it’s his passion and intention for this house. If Toscana isn’t willing to work on it unless it’s lifted citing safety, he must respect that. Disagrees the house won’t be the same once it’s lifted. This foundation is weak because it’s a combination of brick and cobblestone; only half the house has a foundation.

**Backus** – Per HDC survey, circa 1750 typical Nantucket 3-bay. She went into the structure and thinks parts of it are older than 1750. Rear addition was done in the 1990s. Appreciate it’s not moving. Proposed windows should not be SDLs and should be TDL; haven’t seen a window survey to clarify which windows are being removed and why. East basement step-down is new. Recommend that any exterior fabric of the existing foundation be retained. Received letters of concern. Read into the record a letter from Mary Bergman, Executive Director Nantucket Preservation Trust (NPT). We received Hollis Webb’s letter stating no original window is left; the existing are likely 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> generation.

**Alger** – This is a significant structure; Ms. Bergman was very clear. Thinks it’s okay to replace rotting wood; feels doing that doesn’t impact the integrity of the building.

**Bradford** – The HDC shouldn’t decide piecemeal applications to include the related application for parking and shed structure. The addition to this structure is the same size as the main house. This proposal has ignored HDC requests and made additional changes. Proposed renovations are not in keeping with the historic nature of this structure. Feels this proposal priorities profit over preservation.

**Rowland** – Read the historic structures advisory group comments; Ms. Williams objected.

**Rayport** – Old wood structures need to replace rot; but this structure should be approached with preservation in mind. There should be minimal reconstruction. If it’s lifted, it won’t look like an old house any longer. The textures and “oldness” of this house will be destroyed if it is renovated as proposed.

**Welch** – Appreciate it’s not being moved. Laments the effects of 41-81L. Character, setting, and architecture are HDC’s concern, will stick to those items. If the foundation is unsafe, it needs to be rectified. In discussion, there seems to be ambiguity between the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and whether a new foundation affects the historic certification of a structure; he doesn’t believe there is ambiguity. We’ve talked about renovation and reconstruction and restoration; [if replacing] we need to look at replicating the foundation to look markedly as it currently does—not unlike stone pavers installed on Main St., new materials, some old materials that were cut to fit—to include the front steps. North elevation, eliminating the roof walk eliminates contention; chimney is 9” or so too short WRT to the building code. Adding a roof walk on a structure that did not previously have one is to his mind a matter of principle and not his concern; believes these should be determined on a case-by-case basis; historically roof walks were an architectural element in part for status, in part functionality; unfortunately the came to disabuse in the BWNIM narrative and literally falling off roofs—he hopes this never occurs with solar, given we aren’t bonding those installations. Primary concern on the North elevation is modification of the presentation of the entry—he is completely 150,000% against modifying the grade and adding more steps; believes presentation left to right of the entry should not change. Believe the north addition is too wide—i.e., it’s not historically appropriate pushes the envelope by a couple of feet at least, would like to see that trimmed in as a matter of appropriateness. As to matter of brick [foundation] material, believes this should be photographed and height of joints measured for more details, so that materials, proportions, and spacing including parged joints can be replicated. Concept extends around to the sides of the foundation—the rubble should come back into play visually as it does now, which is to say it should have a similar level of replication. Reemphasized it’s inappropriate to change the grade. West elevation is remarkably unchanged except for the width of the addition; however, it’s toward the rear yards and the ridge has been lowered and the addition would be viewed obliquely. South elevation is where reducing the addition 2’ is appropriate. No concerns about the east elevation. The windows, we should be consistent with what we’ve approved in the past; so long as the windows can’t be repaired or reused, they can be replaced—if this has been documented; this is somewhat an open issue. After that’s determined, discussion widens into our having approved SDLs on the side and rear—so discussion becomes about preservation vs. a brand-new window type. Believes anything visible from the front or walking the public way should be TDL. On the idea early mentioned by someone, of new, if something is repaired or added to with new wood, believes the matter isn’t if the material is new or old, but that the historical context is replicated [during reconstruction or rehabilitation]. This begins to involve the effect of work on historic certification, which revolve around how and why something is rebuilt due to disrepair.

**Coombs** – Ms. Bergman’s letter was excellent. *BWNIM* says you don’t add a roof walk if the house never had one. The front entrance shouldn’t be changed. Doesn’t see why they can’t put a supporting foundation wall behind the existing; it provides a very solid foundation. The addition is too wide and conflicts with the existing structure. Beams should be replaced based upon need; they can be saved or sistered without changing the exterior. Thinks all windows should be TDL all the way around. Would like to see the dimensions of what will be demolished.

**Oliver** – Agrees with what’s been said and what Mr. Welch said. We’ve had to pour a foundation on the inside of the rubble so that the outside doesn’t change, especially on the front. There is a disparity of inches between existing and proposed. Should eliminate the outside fireplace. Windows on the street are shown as bigger; the openings should not change. It seems the only thing being kept is the 4 corners of the main mass.

**Camp** – Agrees with much that’s been said. The right massing overwhelms the historic structure and should be reduced.

**Pohl** – HDC’s mandate is to review each individual application on its own merit. The change in the floor level is a concern. A brick foundation is easier to replace than rubbles; reinforcing what’s there is a known issue.

**Motion to Hold for revisions. (Camp)**

Motion

Roll-call vote	Carried //Oliver, Coombs, Welch, Camp, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	
3. NT Properties	Owner <b>08-6946</b> 12 Beach Grass Lot 93 New dwelling	68-856	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Oliver, Thornewill		
Alternates	None		
Recused	None		
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.		
Representing	Linda Williams		
Public	None		
Concerns (6:04)	<p><b>Williams</b> – Presented a redesign in response to previous concerns.</p> <p><b>Thornewill</b> – Front elevation, the dormer should be over the front door. South elevation, the negative space should be eliminated.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Would like to know what’s on either side of this. Agrees the front dormer should move over the door. We need to have what was previously submitted.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Move or modify the front dormer. This is 29’10” and would like to verify the height of the neighbors. This looks very similar to the many we have approved; would like to see what’s on either side.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – He’s fine with centering the front dormer over the door and eliminating the south elevation negative mass.</p>		
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the dormer centered over the front door and eliminating the negative mass on the south. (Thornewill)_</b>		
Roll-call vote	Carried 4-0//Oliver, Welch, Thornewill, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	<b>HDC2022-08-6946</b>
4. Brett Fodiman	<b>10-7279</b> 11 Surfside Road	As-built garage shingle	80/70 Emeritus
5. Brett Fodiman	<b>10-7281</b> 11 Surfside Road	As-built GH shingle	80/70 Emeritus
6. Brett Fodiman	<b>10-7280</b> 11 Surfside Road	As-built MH shingle	80/70 Emeritus
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver		
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill		
Recused	None		
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, and photos.		
Representing	Tim Rogovich		
Public	None		
Concerns (6:12)	<p><b>Rogovich</b> – Reviewed screening. They will grey out fully in the next year or so.</p> <p><b>Backus</b> – Suggested in addition to the landscape screen and add a caveat that when the time comes, they use regular shingles.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – The color of the shingles is still a concern. The garage and studio will be a straight view up the driveway. He doesn’t recall approving the very wide curb openings; they should be reduced to 12’.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – The driveway across the front of the house is much too wide; it’s the same width as the house. Agrees reducing the width of the aprons. She wants to see a redraw of the design.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Doesn’t remember how the driveway was approved across the front of the house and 2 curb cuts. It looks terrible.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Her main concern is the visibility from Surfside Road; that’s what we got the complaints about. There should be supplemental vegetation on the side facing Surfside Road. Feels she doesn’t have enough information to make a decision.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – The approved site plan doesn’t have 2 curb cuts and the opening is much narrower.</p>		
Motion	<b>Motion to View and Hold for revisions per Exhibit A and screening from Surfside Road. (Welch)</b>		
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye	Certificate #	

**VII. NEW BUSINESS 11/08/2022**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Edward Gilberth 10-7346	51 Walsh Street	New roofwalk & stairs	29/61	Linda Williams
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, advisory comments, and <i>BWNIM</i> .			
Representing	Linda Williams			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:34)	<p><b>Williams</b> – Presented project; asked they view this.</p> <p><b>Backus</b> – Sand Piper, HDC circa 1930. There is precedent; natural to weather with no skirt is preferable. Question visibility from Hulbert Avenue. There is precedent for exterior roof walk stairs.</p> <p>Read advisory group comments: The proposed roof walk stairs will be visible from Hulbert Avenue as shown by the included photos. This would set a very bad precedent for applicants to claim non-visibility only to discover that it is visible or becomes visible later due to the removal of natural screening or a building. The applicant is illustrating how this will become a future precedent by citing other unfortunate roof walk stairs. Asked if these examples were approved by the HDC. <i>BWNIM</i> very clearly states that exterior roof walk stairs are not allowed.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – She took photos on her phone, and you can see the exterior stairs from 50 or 48 Hulbert Avenue. The natural to weather roof walk on a cedar roof isn't optimal but okay; her concern is the stairs.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – To the extent that it's not visible, and modification would have to be made, the roof walk should be over the gable forward on the front; suggested rerouting the stairs to minimize them. He's not adverse to a view.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – She is not if favor of this; it looks like the back of a restaurant in the commercial area.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – The exterior stairs as designed shouldn't be approved because we've approved them in the past by mistake. It's not appropriate in this area.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Adjusting the exterior features to meet an interior program is not appropriate.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to View. (Welch)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Camp, Coombs, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
2. Steven Cohen Trustee 11-7383	46 Union Street	Apron, curbing, stepstones	42.2.3/28	Ben Champoux
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	Dutra			
Recused	Coombs			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	None			
Public	Diane Coombs, 44 Union Street			
Concerns (6:45)	<p><b>Backus</b> – Circa 1886 Victorian structure. You should always have historical information included in an application. The Belgium block and peastone is appropriate; appreciate soft stones and no patio. No new contemporary granite should be used. This has been Resilient Nantucket Adapted; all surfaces are permeable. It's a good question if the parking parallel to the street is on Town property.</p> <p>Read advisory group comments: The proposed parking space parallel to the street is a concern. Asked if it is actually on their property or in the street layout. It would be preferable to move this space to the east side of the driveway so that it is behind the hedge and more hidden from the street. This would allow for denser planting next to the house helping to conceal the elevated deck facing Meader Street.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Conservation Commission wants the yard left simple.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – This project has been a great success for the structure. The landscape ties into that. Driveway space on the east should be necked down and the curb reversed so as not to be concave toward the vehicle and add a climbing hydrangea on the raised deck lattice between the house and the car.</p> <p><b>Thornewill</b> – Nothing to add.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – Would like pictures of the elevation. She's opposed to the car parking along the street; she'd prefer a small side-by-side parking.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Nothing to add. Likes Mr. Welch's idea.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with the west end of drive shortened to terminate at the end of the house and add a climbing hydrangea at the deck. (Welch)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Oliver, Thornewill, Welch, and Pohl-aye; Camp-nay		Certificate #	<b>HDC2022-11-7383</b>



<b>3. Susan Hostetler 11-7408</b>	<b>42 Center Street</b>	<b>Roof replacement</b>	<b>42.3.1/63.3</b>	<b>Susan Hostetler</b>
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	Dutra, Thornewill			
Recused	None			
Documentation	None			
Representing	None			
Public	None			
Concerns (6:55)	Not opened at this time.			
Motion	<b>No action at this time.</b>			
Roll-call Vote	N/A		Certificate #	
Break 6:55 to 7:08				
<b>4. Jeff Marsh 11-7388</b>	<b>10 Lowell Place</b>	<b>Remove 82sf from garage</b>	<b>41/166</b>	<b>Val Oliver</b>
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Dutra			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:08)	<b>Oliver</b> – Presented project.			
	<b>Martinez</b> – Read advisory group comments: Check for visibility from Barnabas Lane. If it's visible, this creates an odd negative mass.			
	<b>Backus</b> – HDC survey circa 1933 garage. Alteration is appropriate and change not visible.			
	No concerns as long as the negative mass isn't visible.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Dutra, Welch, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2022-11-7388</b>
<b>5. Jeff Marsh 11-7389</b>	<b>10 Lowell Place</b>	<b>Addition 90sf</b>	<b>41/166</b>	<b>Val Oliver</b>
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Dutra			
Alternates	Thornewill			
Recused	Oliver			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Val Oliver, V. Oliver Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:13)	<b>Oliver</b> – Presented project; windows are TDL with storms.			
	<b>Backus</b> – HDC survey circa 1933 bungalow. Appreciate the scale of the addition. Triple ganged window is an added feature; repetition of 2-3-2 ganged is appropriate and mimics what's there.			
	Read advisory group comments: No concerns, except if kitchen casements are new, they should have divided lights.			
	No concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Dutra, Welch Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2022-11-7389</b>
<b>6. 21 Pleasant St, LLC 01-7624</b>	<b>21 Pleasant Street</b>	<b>Lift house &amp; replace fndtn</b>	<b>55.4.1/1</b>	<b>LINK</b>
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Camp, Thornewill			
Alternates	Dutra, Oliver			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Victoria Ewing, LINK			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:15)	<b>Ewing</b> – Presented project.			
	<b>Backus</b> – Circa 1923-1949 4-square individually significant. Part of this is an as-built situation as the house has been lifted and foundation removed; the foundation should be the same as it was before removal and poured concrete only where poured concrete was previously.			
	<b>Welch</b> – The foundation needs to be replicated as it was. The paint color and height should be replicated as it was. Any modifications on the south elevation are okay. As-built application fees should be applied for removal of the foundation without approval. He has clear images of it being CMU.			
	<b>Camp</b> – Agrees with Mr. Welch.			
	<b>Thornewill</b> – Agrees with Mr. Welch. However, extending the foundation under the deck makes no sense; it should be vertical board.			
	<b>Coombs</b> – Agrees with what's been said.			
	<b>Pohl</b> – Should be 10 times the fee for removal of the foundation.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with replication of the previous foundation of cinder blocks; no extension of the foundation wall under the deck; slab under deck with stick-built wall; and vertical board slatting, and plant material to soften; and payment of the 10-times as-built fee and payment of violation fees. (Welch)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Camp, Coombs, Thornewill, Welch, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2023-01-7624</b>



**VIII. OLD BUSINESS 11/15/2022**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Maxwell House, LLC 02-6805	15 Cliff Road	Addition/renovation	42.4.4./56	MCA+
Voting	Pohl, Welch, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, advisory comments, and <i>BWNNM</i> .			
Representing	Doug Mills, Mark Cutone Architecture			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:29)	<p><b>Mills</b> – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p><b>Backus</b> – Circa 1900 Queen Ann altered in 1996. Would like a window survey to know the age. Not necessary to remove chimneys. Queen Ann window is removal of a historic element. Northwest window configuration is over fenestrated and doesn't comply with <i>BWNNM</i>.</p> <p>Read advisory group comments: The southeast elevation will be very visible through the new driveway opening; this is the front elevation of the house, and it should have a clearly defined front door. The proposed location for the front door is placed in an inconspicuous location detracting from its importance. It has the appearance of a side door. This is a prominent house in the Cliff area and should have a very clearly identifiable front entrance. The oversized 12-over-1 windows will also be visible from Cliff Road and should be more traditional in size and scale. The previously proposed hipped garage roof configuration had a more modest scale compared to the full gable now proposed and gave the structure a more pleasing subordinate relationship to the main house. It should not be changed to a gable. The garage should remain appearing as a detached garage; the connecting roof should be pushed further back from the face so that it is not visible.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – The front door is hard to determine. Doesn't know the size of the 12-over-1 window. Southeast the gang of doors won't be visible. Likes the simpler form of the garage. NE is over fenestrated but that's an existing condition; more consistency would be better. Would like the existing front door to remain the front door, instead of the 4-light. The door facing the street should be simple without the overhang and the shower shouldn't be on Cliff Road.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – Northeast elevation 12-over-1 windows are too big; prefers the existing situation. Southwest elevation door side windows should be larger; the left small window should be larger. The garage height should be lowered; pedestrian door should be wider or have flanking windows.</p> <p><b>Thornewill</b> – Appreciates the street-facing side. The side visible up the driveway is symmetrical, but the garage doors aren't. Agrees about the 12-over-1 windows being large; they draw attention to themselves and make the structure top heavy. Another chimney would help mitigate the roof feeling long. Northeast elevation glass above the deck is okay but the left doors throw it off; same on the southeast elevation.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Agrees with Ms. Thornewill. Southeast elevation garage dormers could be rebated but will be visible obliquely.</p> <p><b>Pohl</b> – Appreciates reduction in the garage height, the previous roof was better than the hipped. All those houses have tons of glass on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor so has no concerns about fenestration. Appreciates comments about alignment of windows.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Hold for revisions. (Coombs)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Welch, Thornewill, Coombs, and Pohl-aye		Certificate #	
2. Petrillo & Ripley 09-7129	92 Washington Street	Hardscape	42.4.1/2	Studio 2112
Voting	Welch, Coombs, Camp, Oliver			
Alternates	None			
Recused	None			
Documentation	Landscape design plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Lynne Giesecke, Studio 2112			
Public	None			
Concerns (7:50)	<p><b>Giesecke</b> – Clarified the scope of work and material. Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.</p> <p><b>Backus</b> – Site needs to comply with Resilient Nantucket Chapter 5: Flood Resilience; received flood certificate. Bluestone pavers are atypical on the harbor. Should have a clear elevation of how the air-conditioning units (A/C) will be covered and to comply with the flood zone requirements.</p> <p>Read advisory group comments: The Belgian block apron at the front gate near the house should not be extended to the north in front of the picket fence. The existing planting bed is a more natural and pleasing material than stone; Belgian blocks should be used for driveway aprons, not random borders around a parking area. The square cut bluestone patio will be very visible from the beach; a more natural looking and shaped material would be more appropriate.</p> <p><b>Camp</b> – There needs to be a surround to screen the elevated A/C. The squared paving is a little formal for being on the beach; should be a natura material more conducive to a beach.</p> <p><b>Oliver</b> – Nothing to add; agrees with Ms. Camp. Bluestone should be replaced; she'd prefer reinforced grass.</p> <p><b>Coombs</b> – The patio might be better with slate with the corners rounded. All the squared corners should be rounded.</p> <p><b>Welch</b> – Agrees with reducing the patio and softening the edges. Need to visually screen the A/C.</p>			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve through staff with all pavers being rounded Goshen stone and a trellis to screen the A/C units. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-0//Camp, Oliver, Coombs, and Welch-aye		Certificate #	<b>HDC2022-09-7129</b>
3. Berry Pleasant, LLC 09-7153	15 Pleasant Street	Main house alterations	42.3.3/123	Patrick Ahern

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill  
 Alternates None  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, correspondence, historical documents, and advisory comments.  
 Representing Mark Tartamella, Patrick Ahern Architects  
 Public None  
 Concerns (8:08) **Tartamella** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.  
**Backus** – Obed Macey house circa 1801. Rear is a like-kind replacement. Would like the age of the 12/12 window to be removed; it should be stored in the basement  
 No concerns.  
 Motion **Motion to Approve as submitted. (Oliver)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Thornewill, Coombs, Oliver, and Pohl-aye Certificate # **HDC2022-09-7153**

4.	Jason Mendelson <b>05-6328</b>	7A Sherburne Turnpike	New Dwelling	30/112	Studio Ppark
5.	Sherburne Tpk, LLC <b>10-7305</b>	7A Sherburne Turnpike	Pool & hardscape	30/112.1	Atlantic Landscaping

Voting Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Thornewill  
 Alternates Dutra, Welch  
 Recused None  
 Documentation None  
 Representing None  
 Public None  
 Concerns (8:12) Not opened at this time.  
 Motion **No action at this time.**  
 Roll-call Vote N/A Certificate #

6.	<b>NIR 08-6885</b>	7-8 Old South Wharf	Fenestration changes	42.4.2/3.4	Permit Plus
----	--------------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------	-------------

Voting Camp (acting chair), Coombs, Oliver, Thornewill  
 Alternates None  
 Recused None  
 Documentation Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, historical documents, and advisory comments.  
 Representing Mark Poor, Permits Plus  
 Public None  
 Concerns (8:12) **Poor** – Reviewed changes made per previous concerns.  
**Backus** – Circa 1969; appreciate keeping north to original configuration. 6-light would be more appropriate and are original; door should remain batten.  
 Read advisory group comments: North elevation 8-light windows should be made into smaller 6-light windows; this would provide more shingled wall area and look less cluttered. South 4 ganged windows should be separated, and the door should remain a batten door. These are simple buildings meant to resemble scalloping shanties; too much fenestration and too many doors detract from that feel; the small single windows and batten doors are character defining elements and should not be changed to inappropriate ganged units.  
**Oliver** – Appreciate the changes. Okay with the 8-light windows but 6-lights okay too.  
**Coombs** – North elevation 8-lights should go back to 6-lights. Keep it as simple as possible with batten doors.  
**Thornewill** – Nothing to add.  
 Motion **Motion to Approve through staff with the 4-over-4s going to 3-over-3s and batten door remaining batten and no bumpout on the west. (Coombs)**  
 Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Oliver, Thornewill, Coombs, and Camp-aye Certificate # **HDC2022-08-6885**

7.	Not So Easy, LLC <b>06-5679</b>	26 Easy Street	New mixed-use structure	42.4.2/23	Emeritus LTD
8.	Doherty Ack, LLC <b>08-6934</b>	2 Mariner Way	New dwelling	55.1.4/72.4	Linda Williams
9.	Doherty Ack, LLC <b>08-6937</b>	2 Mariner Way	New 2 <sup>nd</sup> dwelling	55.1.4/72.4	Linda Williams
10.	Doherty Ack, LLC <b>08-6939</b>	4 Mariner Way	New 3 <sup>rd</sup> dwelling	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
11.	Doherty Ack, LLC <b>08-6941</b>	4 Mariner Way	New garage/apt	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
12.	Doherty Ack, LLC <b>08-6943</b>	4 Mariner Way	Hardscape	55.1.4/72	Linda Williams
13.	Doherty Ack, LLC <b>08-6930</b>	6 Mariner Way	New dwelling	55.1.4/72.2	Linda Williams
14.	Doherty Ack, LLC <b>08-6931</b>	6 Mariner Way	Hardscape	55.1.4/72.2	Linda Williams

**IX. NEW BUSINESS 11/29/2022**

<u>Property owner name</u>	<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Scope of work</u>	<u>Map/Parcel</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1. Richard Snowden 11-7480	10 Massachusetts Ave	Add doors & balcony	60.3.1/336	Thornewill Design
Voting	Pohl, Coombs, Camp, Oliver, Dutra			
Alternates	None			
Recused	Thornewill			
Documentation	Architectural elevation plans, site plan, photos, and advisory comments.			
Representing	Luke Thornewill, Thornewill Design			
Public	None			
Concerns (8:23)	<b>Thornewill</b> – Presented project. <b>Backus</b> – Recent construction. The 15-light balcony door should be a 12-light with kick panel. <b>Oliver</b> – It should have 1 balcony door like the one on Tennessee Avenue. <b>Camp</b> – Agrees. <b>Coombs</b> – Agrees. <b>Dutra</b> – This balcony has more space than the one on Tennessee Avenue. <b>Pohl</b> – He has no concerns.			
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve as submitted. (Camp)</b>			
Roll-call Vote	Carried 4-1//Coombs, Dutra, Camp, and Pohl-aye; Oliver-nay	Certificate #	<b>HDC2022-11-7480</b>	
2. Charles Schwarzanpfel	9 Main Avenue	New Pool	60.31/425	NAG
3. Sachus Corner, LC	1 East Hallowell	Move off/demo grg bnkr	30/100	Linda Williams
4. Charles Chasin	24 Pleasant Street	Hardscape: patio & fence	42.3.2/49	Linda Williams
5. Pact, LLC	41 Orange Street	Window replacement	42.3.2/224	Linda Williams
6. K225, LLC	126 Main Street	New parking area	42.3.3/98	Linda Williams
7. Thomas McGrath	78 Cliff Road	Move off/demo dwelling	30/71	Linda Williams
8. 44 Monomoy, LLC	44 Monomoy Road	MH addition	54/72	Workshop APD
9. 44 Monomoy, LLC	44 Monomoy Road	Shed move off/demo	54/72	Workshop APD
10. 44 Monomoy, LLC	44 Monomoy Road	Garage move on site	54/72	Workshop APD
11. 44 Monomoy, LLC	44 Monomoy Road	New guest house	54/72	Workshop APD
12. 44 Monomoy, LLC	44 Monomoy Road	New shed	54/72	Workshop APD
13. 44 Monomoy, LLC	44 Monomoy Road	Hardscape	54/72	Ahern
14. Trustee Sherburne TP Trust	19 Sherburne Tp Lot 8	New main dwelling	30/173	Workshop APD
15. Trustee Sherburne TP Trust	19 Sherburne Tp Lot 8	New garage/studio	30/173	Workshop APD
16. Trustee Sherburne TP Trust	19 Sherburne Tp Lot 8	New shed	30/173	Workshop APD
17. Lord family, LLC	15 Coffin Street Sias	Demo shed addition	73.4.1/34	EMDA
18. 12 Derrymore R.T.	12 Derrymore Lane	New dwelling	41/241	EMDA
19. 12 Derrymore R.T.	12 Derrymore Lane	Garage revisions	41/241	EMDA
20. Hannah Gardner House, LLC	6 Gull Island Lane	Rev. fenestration	42.4.3/61	Sarah McLane
21. Margaret Manganaro	7 Summer Street	Roof replacement	42.3.3/114	Ned Paul
22. Duncan Richardson	21 Golfview Drive	New dwelling	66/174	SMRD
23. Thomas Wroe	4 Westerwick Drive	New dwelling	73/32	EMDA
24. Slacktide	84 Cliff Road	Roof replacement	30/74.1	SCI
25. Love of Fair, LLC	19 Fair Street	Color change	42.3.2/169	JMS Architect
26. Sankaty, LLC	49 Sankaty Road	Rev. 06-6479: add chimney	49/66	Dustin Maury
27. Sankaty, LLC	49 Sankaty Road	Hardscape	49/66	Dustin Maury
28. Brian Hidders	51 Meadow View Drive	New garage	56/113	Thornewill Design
29. Brian Hidders	51 Meadow View Drive	Addition & front door	56/113	Thornewill Design
30. Brian Hidders	51 Meadow View Drive	Spa & fire	56/113	Thornewill Design
31. David Pfund	24 Union Street	Renovation	42.3.2/177	Thornewill Design
32. 41 Hulbert, LLC	41 Hulbert Avenue	MH massing/fenestration	29/18	Botticelli & Pohl
33. John Bartlett	19 Bartlett Farm Road	Solar roof array	65/16.1	ACK Smart
34. Jerry Michaud	58 Walsh Street	Solar roof array	29/97	ACK Smart
35. Tamora Wing	52 West Chester Street	New guest house	41/381	Emeritus
36. 63 Hulbert, LLC	63 Hulbert Avenue	LK foundation, siding, wnd	29/9	Emeritus
37. Waterfalls Enterprises, LLC	7 Union Street	LK siding & windows	42.3.1/146	Emeritus
38. Prickley Pear	17 Broadway	Storage big revisions	73.1.3/112	Val Oliver

<b>X. OTHER HDC BUSINESS</b>	
Approved Minutes	December 13, 2022
Motion	<b>Motion to Approve. (Camp)</b>
Roll-call vote	Carried 5-0//Oliver, Coombs, Dutra, Camp, and Pohl-aye
Review Minutes	December 20, 2022
Next Meeting	<b>Tuesday, January 10<sup>th</sup> @ 4:00 pm</b> Hybrid – Zoom & 4 Fairgrounds Road, Community Room
Future action items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classification of street trees &amp; vegetating mapping</li> <li>• Discussion of Wind Turbines</li> <li>• Section 106 – Sunrise Wind Farm Project, intro (update as needed)</li> <li>• Review policy of move/demo hearings in relation to new dwellings</li> <li>• Hardscaping</li> <li>• Discussion of salvaging demolitions</li> <li>• Discussion of options for house moves</li> </ul>

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft minutes as listed

Adjournment:

Motion           **Motion to adjourn at 8:31 pm. (Camp)**  
 Roll-call vote   Carried 5-0//Oliver, Dutra, Coombs, Camp, and Pohl-aye

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton

Nantucket Old Historic District

Sconset Old Historic District

Madaket Village District